

Dylan Hackett (SBN: 329339)  
dylanhackett@hackettfirm.com  
Chris Quattrocio (SBN: 331233)  
cquattrocio@hackettfirm.com  
The Hackett Law Firm  
P.O. Box 330168  
San Francisco, CA 94133  
(415) 410-9931  
(213) 782-8876

*Attorneys for Plaintiff, Barbara Ratcliffe*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

BARBARA RATCLIFFE,

Plaintiff,

vs.

YOCHA DEHE WINTUN NATION D/B/A CACHE  
CREEK CASINO RESORT,

Defendant

Case No.:

**COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**  
**1. DISCRIMINATION PER CA FEHA**  
**2. WRONGFUL TERMINATION**

BARBARA RATCLIFFE, the Plaintiff herein, hereby complains and alleges as follows:

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1. Barbara Ratcliffe, a 42-year-old Asian (Filipino) member of the LGBTQIA+ community and single mother of two, was employed by Cache Creek Casino Resort (“CCCR”) as an IT Project Manager. With over 20 years of experience in the field, Ms. Ratcliffe was a seasoned IT professional who consistently met the demands of her role. In addition to her responsibilities at CCCR, Ms. Ratcliffe was engaged in side ventures as a realtor and real estate investor. She asserts that these side endeavors did not interfere with her work at CCCR, as she managed them during non-working hours and hired professional property managers to handle her real estate investments.

2. On April 25, 2023, Ms. Ratcliffe’s employment with CCCR was terminated. CCCR did not cite any formal policy violations or work performance issues that could have justified her termination. Furthermore, the company did not have a written remote work policy that might have clarified expectations regarding the use of work equipment, such as computers or the Internet, for personal matters. Despite this, Ms. Ratcliffe believes that her termination was influenced by factors related to her race, sex, and familial status.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES



1 that CCCR did not provide a written remote work policy or cite any specific policy violations, the  
2 ambiguity surrounding Ms. Ratcliffe's termination further supports the inference of discriminatory intent.

3  
4 **B. Legitimacy of Side Ventures as a Reason for Termination**

5 Moreover, CCCR's failure to document any performance issues or policy violations undermines any  
6 potential defense that Ms. Ratcliffe's side ventures interfered with her work. Employers are required to  
7 provide legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for adverse employment actions and must prove that these  
8 reasons were the actual basis for the action taken. In this case, CCCR has not provided any such  
9 justification, which strengthens Ms. Ratcliffe's claim of discrimination.

10 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

11 **(Wrongful Termination in Violation of Public Policy)**

12 Additionally, under California law, if an employer did not violate FEHA, an employee's claim for wrongful  
13 termination in violation of public policy necessarily fails. Since Ms. Ratcliffe's termination appears to be influenced  
14 by her protected characteristics, it constitutes a violation of FEHA, thereby supporting her wrongful termination  
15 claim.

16 **CONCLUSION**

17 In conclusion, the termination of Ms. Ratcliffe from CCCR appears to be influenced by discriminatory  
18 motives related to her race, sex, sexual orientation, and familial status. The lack of a formal remote work policy and  
19 the absence of documented performance issues further question the legitimacy of her termination. Therefore, Ms.  
20 Ratcliffe has a strong legal basis to claim that her termination was unlawful under FEHA.

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

28 //

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendant as follows:

1. For general damages, according to proof;
2. For compensatory damages;
3. For reasonable attorney's fees, as provided by statute;
4. For costs of suit; and
5. For such other relief as the Court may deem meet and proper.

DATED: October 4, 2024

*Dylan Hackett*

---

Dylan Hackett, Esq.  
Attorney for Plaintiff, Barbara Ratcliffe